

# New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements  
Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

FRIDAY, AUGUST 29, 1919

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Inc., 100 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. President: G. V. Rogers, Vice-President: Helen Rogers Hall, Secretary: F. A. Suter, Treasurer: Adolph T. Rosenfeld, 100 Nassau Street, New York, Telephone, BRexham 3600

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

One Year \$10.00  
Six Months \$5.00  
Three Months \$2.50  
Daily only \$1.00  
Sunday only \$0.50  
Foreign Rates \$15.00 per year

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter

GUARANTEE  
You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety for if dissatisfied in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No questions. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS  
The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for publication of all news dispatches received to it or not otherwise credited in this paper and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein.

All rights of reproduction of all other matter herein are also reserved.

## Fair Prices for Meat

If the understanding arrived at yesterday between representatives of 2,500 butchers and Arthur Williams, Federal Food Administrator, is correctly described, a butcher is to be considered "fair" if he charges no more to his retail customers than specific margins over the prices he pays to the meat wholesalers.

The schedule as published permits him to collect from a customer the wholesale price plus 13 cents a pound for chuck steak, 24 cents for the best roast beef, 17 cents for sirloin steak, 14 cents on legs of mutton, 13 cents on breakfast bacon, and so on.

The buyer who purchases an eight-pound roast will thus pay \$1.92 to the butcher for service and for profit; if he buys a three-pound sirloin the butcher will get 51 cents for service and profit, and for a ten-pound fillet of bacon the butcher, for wrapping the package (for the system is "cash and carry" and provides for no delivery), gets \$1.30. It does not seem as if the "fair price" schedule is unduly oppressive of meat vendors.

On high authority we are told that the big packers are unconscionable robbers. And the packers, exhibiting their books to a series of investigators, say that they retain but 2 cents out of every dollar they handle for profit and interest on their investment—that they pay \$92 a head for cattle and sell the meat therefrom for \$80, and survive only through a skillful use of by-products. Yet the retailers, for a comparatively simple service, are authorized to retain approximately 50 cents out of every dollar they handle. It is most confusing.

## General Louis Botha

General Louis Botha's career is a striking tribute to the broad-minded tolerance and wisdom of British policy in South Africa. Botha was a fighting Boer—a self-made soldier of remarkable ability. He was in command of the Boer forces in the Ladysmith campaign, and when the aged General Joubert died he succeeded to the post of commander in chief of the Orange Free State and Transvaal armies. He maintained a guerrilla war against the British with great energy and success. He won the admiration of his opponents not only for his tenacity and resourcefulness, but also for his unflinching observance of the humanities of warfare.

A brave and honorable foe, Botha accepted in good faith the Boer surrender and became a leader in reconstruction. British policy encouraged men of his stamp. He became one of the founders of the autonomous Union of South Africa, which, under his leadership, has developed into a loyal and powerful unit in the British Empire.

His work and the liberal statesmanship at London which allowed him to do his work bore its fruits when Great Britain declared war on Germany. Germany had established in German Southwest Africa a base from which to attack British sovereignty in the Union. Propaganda based on the animosities of the Boer war had undermined the loyalty of many of the old Boer leaders. De Wet, the "Stonewall" Jackson of the Boer lost cause, succumbed to German suggestions. He raised the standard of rebellion. But Botha, at the head of the Union government, quickly hunted down and dispersed the rebels. Had a policy of repression been followed after the Boer peace the whole of South Africa might easily have become pro-German. As it was, the Maritz-Byers-De Wet revolt was snuffed out and Botha not only conquered German Southwest Africa, but furnished the troops, under General Smuts, which eventually broke down German resistance in German East Africa.

Botha vastly enlarged the British dominions in Africa. He welded the people of the Union as they had never been welded before. He helped to establish the power and prestige of the self-governing British states—Canada, the Australian Commonwealth and the South African Union—and put new vitality into the conception of free association and friendly cooperation on which the relations of these republican states and the mother kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland are founded.

Botha completed the labors of Rhodes. He and Smuts were outstanding figures at the Paris peace conference. The men

whom Great Britain conquered were won to her service by magnanimity. And they repaid that magnanimity a hundred-fold in the hour of the empire's peril.

## The Will of Andrew Carnegie

The will of Andrew Carnegie, yesterday filed for probate, furnishes a fitting final chapter to a romantic life. Brought to this country by poor immigrant parents, a bobbin boy in his early teens, a stoker and fireman, and then a telegraph operator, Carnegie became millionaire and multi-millionaire, enjoying the distinction of having been the second largest accumulator of wealth the world has ever known.

Then, reaching with both hands into the boxes containing his evidences of ownership, he scattered the contents until his benefactions reached in value more than \$350,000,000; and at last, when his testament was opened, it furnished evidence that he had retained a mere working balance of his business of philanthropy, less than one-tenth of his former possessions. The Scriptures reckoned that a tithe squared accounts with heaven; here was a man who thithed himself nine times. In his lifetime he often met much scoffing and not a few sneers. The scoffers and the sneerers probably have queer feelings as they read this morning.

Yet in a certain sense Andrew Carnegie never owned anything or gave away anything. If he had kept in his own name the wealth that stood there his dynamic power would have continued to do beneficent work. The income would have gone into works that by their mere existence are to public advantage. This income now supports a vast number of institutions and foundations and moves wrinkles of care from a vast army of pensioners who have been too busy to make money. But wherever the title was, the great steel works, carrying on their vast labor of improving the earth as a place of human habitation, would have gone on. Our social fabric is so interwoven that it is often difficult to say whether it is better to give than to keep. It would be a calamity, as has been discovered in other lands and times, to place all ownership in dead hands, even though the motive were high and noble. Colleges and libraries and foundations are good things, but so also are railroads and terminals.

The rich men of America have been diligent in making the most of opportunities spread before them. They have accumulated with great zeal, but that, on the whole, they have been mindful of the claims of their silent partner, the public, and have prevented dollar worship from corroding their souls, is shown by a generosity without precedent. For the class Andrew Carnegie set a mark not likely soon to be equalled.

## The Jim Ham Doctrine

The details and ramifications and meanderings of the covenant of the league of nations the average American does not pretend to know much about. But concerning the struggle at Washington he has gained a tight grip on at least two fundamental facts. One is that a contest is on between those who would weaken and those who would impair our future liberty of national action.

The other is that an attempt is in progress to atrophy that part of the Constitution which makes the Senate a partner in treaty-making and thus prevents any one man having uncontrolled power over foreign relations, such as the former Kaiser possessed and used to start a world war.

Concerning the first question, the public may be regarded as having made up its mind; the covenant, to be ratified, must be Americanized—must impose neither a legal nor a moral obligation to go to war at the command of any outside power. This country will do its duty should necessity again arise, as the boys in khaki did it during 1918, but we, no others, must be the judge in any particular case of the obligations of the situation. On this issue, it is squarely presented, only a few narrow partisans would vote to hamstring America.

But in the stress of the times adequate consideration has scarcely been given to the issue of whether Presidents are to make war and conclude peace as they please, with no responsibility to any other branch of the government. Do we want a dictatorship with respect to foreign relations? Would we lodge with any man authority so transcendent and so destructive of democracy?

Granted that the present President can be trusted, are we willing to trust his successors with similar power throughout the generations? It seems indispensable to have a check on the executive department. If the treaty is ratified according to the "sign here" theory, there will be no check. A precedent will be made that will control. If the campaign to coerce the present Senate succeeds, future Senates will have about as much control over foreign relations as the Roman Senate had over the Emperor who pretended to act in its name.

As an historic President Wilson, in discussing the effort of President Polk to exclude the Senate, said the Polk policy was one of "usurpation." Out-Polking Polk, what word is to be used in describing the Wilson policy? Senator Hitchcock might try to answer.

The policy of the President since the signing of the armistice has been cynically open. He refused to consult with the Senate or any one of known independence. He named himself as the sole voice of America. He went abroad to mature the commands he purposed to address to the American people. He helped draw a document which he signed; he wrote "in his own name and by his proper authority."

Then he came home and announced

that not one jot or tittle must be abated. A curse almost as sweeping as that contained in the Apocalypse was launched at those who would add or subtract a word. In effect he forbade debate, for, of course, there is no reason for debate if the debaters are not permitted to make decisions. The public might read the covenant, but only for information as to what obligations had been laid on it.

What would have been said by such an organ of public opinion as *The World* if President Roosevelt had ever similarly disregarded the spirit of the Constitution? What would Democratic Senators now be saying if Charles E. Hughes had been elected and he had ventured (as he never would have done) to announce that he would rule without consultation or review of his acts? Yet *The World* and forty-five out of forty-seven Democratic members of the Senate are doing as they are told to do so while denying they are controlled by partisan or personal motives.

The Senate had no option but to make a record that would be a stumbling block to usurpation. It might have been brought to countenance a bad treaty, but it was bound to fight to save the Constitution and a central principle of democracy. Except for party pressure unscrupulously employed, it is doubtful if ten Senators could be mustered to countenance the proposed practical destruction of a vital element of our whole scheme of government.

*The World* has seen fit recently to discuss junkerism. One of the things at stake at Washington is whether junkerism in an extreme form is to prevail—whether Presidents, like Kaisers, are to travel about, making such agreements as seem good to them, defining in secretly prepared and unreviewable instruments what the obligations of this country are to be.

There was laughter when Jim Ham Lewis fathered a resolution which approved in advance anything the President might do. But amusement was untimely. There is the spectacle of forty-five dummy Senators acting in accord with the Jim Ham doctrine.

## The French Elections

Clemenceau promised the Chamber of Deputies the other day that the membership of both branches of the French parliament would be renewed before a new President is chosen next January. For the election of Deputies a new system of representation has been adopted. The system of small districts (arrondissements), each choosing a single member, has been modified. Many bigger districts have been formed, in which three, four, five or six Deputies are to be elected on a general ticket. No candidate can run in more than one constituency. The shift to larger districts has been made in the hope of obtaining better candidates and broader representation.

Another novelty has been introduced. That is representation of minorities. This device works out in the following manner:

The total vote is divided by the number of seats—the figure resulting being called the quotient. All candidates having an actual majority are elected. Of those having less than an absolute majority two seats go to the highest candidates and the party whose average vote is twice the quotient. Seats then go to the highest candidates of the weaker parties whose average vote exceeds the quotient.

Thus, in a constituency choosing six Deputies, suppose that 9,904 votes are cast. The quotient would be 1,650. The strongest party averaged 43,151 votes; the next strongest 28,000, and the weakest 17,300. If one candidate of the leading party received more than a majority he would get a seat. Two others of that party would win because the average party vote was twice the quotient. The highest candidates of the two weaker parties would then get certificates because the average vote of each exceeded the quotient. One seat would be left over. It would go to the fourth highest candidate of the leading party.

This scheme insures a fair representation of the sentiment of each constituency. It will probably enlarge the membership of the main groups in the Chamber and reduce the shadings between parties, which have made ministries more or less unstable. It is an interesting modification of the principle of plurality rule which obtains in most democratic election systems.

## First

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: In reading an account in your paper today concerning the 1st Division of the A. E. F. I find that you have been slightly misinformed in regard to the exploits of that division.

They were not the first to repel a raid or conduct a raid, this honor falling to the 26th Yankee Division of New England. Another point which is not generally clear is that the first division to cross to France complete in men, equipment, etc., was also the 26th.

The first division of the A. E. F. to receive military honors from the allies of the United States was once more the 26th; one unit, the 104th Infantry, having the Croix de Guerre pinned to its flag and 117 officers and enlisted men being decorated the same day, May 4, 1918.

ALFRED W. BARBER.

Williamstown, Mass., Aug. 23, 1919.

## That Soviet Election

(From The Wichita Beacon)  
Communists won the recent election in Petrograd with ease. Those who had government jobs voted to hold them, and the six other people were afraid to vote.

## The Legal Minimum

(From The El Paso Times)  
We wonder at times if America is 2 1/2 per cent sane.

## The Conning Tower

### Settling the Question

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Baron Ireland is now advertising writer for a department store. \* Ed. Conning Tower.)  
Who'd think there lay a threnody—an epopee—a monody

In ads for voices or white batistes or swissly yoked pajamas?

Who'd fancy, pray, a triquet deep hidden in a violet

Or pink or pansy orandy? Who'd think that panoramas

Of visted glamour mystical there lurked behind statistical

And stilted talks of markdawns for the person who indites 'em?

Who'd think such realms of beauty lay in ads wherein dull duty lay?

Well, if there's any one who does, it's not the guy that writes 'em!

BARON IRELAND.  
\*Marshall Field & Co., Chicago.

It interests K. L. S. that actors apparently have only one symbol for expression of appreciation—applause. "When most of us nod or smile," she observes, "they become manically frantic. At the organizing of the Fidelity League, Louis Mann said: 'Let me read the synonimes for Fidelity: honesty, devotion, loyalty (and the rest)'. He read then and there was a roar of clapping, and I said: 'Why, they applaud even the Theatrons. Three cheers for Roget!' And an actor beside me started a cheer."

## The Education of Henry Adams

(From the summary of the first round)  
G. A. L. Dionne, New York, defeated Henry Adams, Englewood, N. J., 7-5, 6-1, 6-2.

Three childless contrives—Art, Ethel and Billie—prove, from the text of "Daisy Ashford," that it could not have been written by a nine-year-old girl. Perhaps it could not have been, but it was. And, as the fellow said, That's our story and we stick to it.

Old Ray Fiedick notes that the Londoners elide the *z*. Sign on an Oxford Street building: "This building will contain shops and flats." "And why not," adds Raymond, who will have his *z*, "call it the Singer Building?"

Mr. James P. Sinnott, the Evening Mail's lawn tennis expert, is a daring prophet. "To-day," he wrote Wednesday, "Williams and Richards face each other, which means that one must give way and drop out." And no forecaster ever was more justified by the result.

**The Poor School Teacher: or, You Can't Win**

If she is strict, people say she does not allow the children to exercise their individuality. If she is not strict, people say she cannot maintain discipline.

If she pays great attention to her appearance, she is merely looking for a husband. If she does not pay great attention to her appearance, she is a bad example for the children.

If she enjoys theatres, cards, and dances, she is a disgrace to her profession. If she refrains from such pleasures, she is a crank.

If she sticks to her subject, she is a fanatic. If she diverts from her subject, then she is talkative and rambling.

If she gives up her position to marry, she is a fool. If she does not give up her position to marry, she is a fool.

WILL LOUP.

Emendations to and comments on "Abdul, the Bullah Amer," continue to come, but L. B. submits another song, which her father learned at Kenyon College. "Kafoozleum" it is called; and it follows:

In ancient days there lived a Turk,  
A horrid beast within the East,  
He did the Prophet's holy work,  
The Bah-bah of Jerusalem.  
He had a daughter, sweet and smirky,  
Cuddled fair and dark like blue hair,  
And taught about her like a Turk,  
Except her name, Kafoozleum.

Chorus:  
Oh, Kafoozleum! Kafoozleum!  
Oh, Kafoozleum! Kafoozleum!  
Oh, Kafoozleum! The daughter of the Bah-bah!

A youth resided near to she,  
His name was Sam, a perfect lamb,  
He was of ancient pedigree,  
He came from old Methusalem!  
He drove a trade that prospered well,  
In skins of cats and ancient hats,  
And ringing at the Bah-bah's bell,  
He saw and loved Kafoozleum.

"I Sam had been a Musselman  
He might have sold the Bah-bah old,  
And with a verse of Al Koran  
Have managed to bamboozle 'um.  
But, oh, dear, no! He tried to scheme,  
Passed one night late the arena gate,  
And stole onto the Turk's haven  
To carry off Kafoozleum.

The Bah-bah was about to smoke,  
His slaves rushed in with horrid din,  
"Mashallah! does your house have broke!  
Come down, my lord, and tootle 'um!"  
The Bah-bah wretched his face in smiles,  
Came down the stair and witnessed there  
A gentleman in three old ties  
A-kissing of Kafoozleum!

The pious Bah-bah said no more  
Than twenty prayers, but went upstairs,  
And drew a bowstring from the drawer,  
And came back to Kafoozleum.  
The youth and maiden then he took,  
And choked them both, and nothing loath,  
Together threw them in the brook  
Of Kedron near Jerusalem.

And still the ancient legend goes—  
When day is gone from Lebanon,  
And when the eastern moonlight throws  
A shadow o'er Jerusalem,  
Between the wailings of the cats,  
A sound there falls on ruined walls,  
A ghost is seen in those old hats,  
A-kissing of Kafoozleum.

Mr. George Cohan decided against naming it the Actors' Protective Association, as the initials might irritate many; so it appears that it will be called the Fidelity Protective Association. Thanks for the ad, George.

"Fits and Starts" is suggested by H. B. P. as a book-title; and "The Undying Lyre," by A.

Swinging around the circle, as the President's imminent sentimental journey is called, is one thing; but squaring it is Something Else Again.

The majority members of the Committee on Military Law of the American Bar Association have declared, and we believe justly, that the death penalty for women spies should not be eliminated.

Volts for women! E. P. A.

# Radicalism

By Pomeroy Burton

Formerly of New York; now manager of The London Daily Mail and its associated newspapers.

I HAVE just returned from a trip through the West, in the course of which I had exceptional opportunities to study conditions.

With strikes and labor unrest everywhere, attention is being rapidly focused on labor as a main issue. Employers, large and small, have taken the line of least resistance in nearly every section of the West, according to repeated demands of the workers, whether well based or not, and "getting their own back" by the simple process of marking up their products to the extent of the concessions made, thus contributing to the high cost of living and adding fuel to the flame of discontent.

## False Leaders

It is only now beginning to dawn upon these men that their shortsighted policy of playing into the hands of the radical labor leaders is likely to cost them dearly in the reckoning which is sure to come.

The fact is that they have provided the extremist leaders who are now in control of the labor situation with their strongest weapon, and that weapon has been used unsparingly to force into the radical camp many thousands of straight-thinking workmen who have no real sympathy with their present leaders, and who would welcome a chance to get on the right track. False leaders and unsound theories are prevailing, partly by sheer force of persistence, but largely because of lack of leadership on the side of common sense and justice.

To-day, by means of systematic organization and ceaseless activity, the radical labor leaders are making headway in the Western states, sweeping into line great numbers of wage earners—many of them property owners themselves—who would welcome a sounder, saner programme if only one were provided.

## Labor in Motors

I have talked with workers in Tacoma, Seattle, Spokane and elsewhere.

I have heard the I. W. W. orators haranguing their deeply attentive audiences on the vacant lots.

I have seen the shipyard forces come out from work in the afternoon and whirl away in more than one thousand automobiles of various late makes and styles, all owned by the workers themselves.

I have seen among them high school teachers and church workers who dropped their old callings and took jobs at the shipyards because of the high wages offered.

These wage standards, which have set the pace for other concerns, are out of all proportion to production, and must eventually recoil upon the workers themselves, but they are regarded by them now, generally speaking, as labor's right and proper due.

## Signs Are Ominous

Everywhere dangerous theorists are in control of the labor organizations, and the plain outspoken policy of most of them, as evidenced by their speeches and their vast quantities of literature with which the whole country is flooded, seems to be to destroy capital, to ignore property rights and to take a shortcut, via the soviet route, to ultra-socialism.

It is an ominous sign that in this feverish rush toward some new state of things even strong Northwestern farm granges and the railway brotherhoods have now joined, and this despite the fact that in the movement which they are now virtually a part of, the very fundamentals of economic laws are being ignored, forcing the cost of living constantly higher, and creating unhealthy conditions in which the workers themselves must ultimately be the principal sufferers.

It is time for a strong lead to be given which will encourage the people—especially the working people, who are being led sadly astray—to think straight and understand the basic elements of the labor question and of other questions equally important which must be dealt with soon in the interests of the country at large.

It devolves upon the aroused business men of this country more than upon any other class or body of citizens to get promptly to work and save the situation.

## Something To Do

It will not do for capital, as capital, to raise a big fund and start out to fight this radical movement. If it tried that to-day the chances are that capital would be beaten. The extremist labor leaders would welcome such a challenge.

But if the men who represent all grades and kinds of business throughout every part

of the United States were to unite in a movement not to fight labor, not to fight capital, but fearlessly to expose the faults of both and simply and fairly to spread the truth, they could turn the whole trend of events and avert consequences that are not pleasant to contemplate. These frequent strikes are largely tests of strength, and they are multiplying rapidly. Conditions are growing steadily worse the country over.

## Militant Minorities

A sane, strong counter movement would, I am sure, command the approval and cooperation of the decent, sound element in labor, and that embraces the great majority of workers throughout the country. They are being led and driven to-day by a minority and a very dangerous, economically unsound minority at that.

These men, who are deliberately trying to force soviet government upon this country and who have had everything pretty much their own way up to now, must be routed for good and all before a healthy state of affairs can be established here. But such unsound leaders cannot continue their sway in the face of an avalanche of facts—in the face of simple truths—truths and facts which have been too long withheld.

## The Great Truth

The greatest of all these truths—and the one least understood to-day the world over—is the fixed and absolute relationship that exists, and must ever exist, between wages and production.

Get that fact once clear in the popular mind and the agitator who now harangues the workers, urging them to seize "their share" of capital, to "take over the works," to destroy government in order to rebuild, and all the rest of it, will have to take a back seat; his sway will be ended and reason and common sense will come into their own again.

But it is not going to be easy to bring this change about in the face of conditions that exist right now. Even the conservative business element throughout the country is suspected by labor, and any campaign of education, however good and however well intentioned, will have to be forced home hard and persistently to be made effective. But the sooner such a campaign is undertaken the better for all concerned.

What is most needed is a strong government lead in this direction, which would rally the conservative patriotic element of the whole country, including the women—for the home is threatened by this radical movement—together with the immense number of workpeople who have no real sympathy with the labor leaders now in control and who are dead against all forms of Bolshevism and I. W. W.-ism.

## Wanted: A Platform

Provide such a combination of the country's best elements with a platform upon which all could stand and work together, and there would quickly develop just that measure of strength which the present situation urgently demands. Any such organization proving its worth in this emergency would also be available for useful work in dealing with the other problems which must soon be faced and which, apparently, are at present but little understood by the public at large.

If no effective steps are taken in the immediate future to put the industrial house in order here and to remove the acute dangers which threaten, it is quite within the range of possibility that the industrial nations of Europe, prostrate and beset with troubles as they are to-day, may emerge and forge rapidly ahead before really sound conditions will have been established in the United States.

## Main Things

The main things that this trip has impressed upon my mind is the absolute lack of sound leadership in labor circles and the failure of business men and the public generally to realize the danger they are courting in sitting idly by while the extremist movement sweeps on, gaining in momentum every day.

However, in this connection I will say that the recent demand of the railway brotherhoods for the control of the railroads of the whole country by the railway workers has given a big jolt to the business men in all parts of the country; it has made them sit up and rub their eyes. In the cities I visited after the publication of the railway workers' pronunciamento I found much evidence of alarm and a really healthy agitation of mind which promises some sort of definite action in future.

## A "Proffiter" Speaks

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I read an article on the editorial page regarding servant proffitering. If the women think that the servant girls are endangering their home and comforts why don't they do their own work instead of breaking up their homes and sending their children to boarding school? Can a child find motherly love or happiness among strange people? Why don't they make their homes a paradise and show those big proffiterers that they can do without them?

Who did the proffitering, if not the American women? They hired general housekeepers for \$10 or \$12 per month. They had to do the laundry, chambermaid, cook and nurse and do the mending, work all hours without a limit. Then the girls didn't endanger the homes or comfort of the American women, but the girls ruined their own health and comfort. Then there was no proffitering. And what are girls of to-day? Don't they have to slave as ever, and if they get a few dollars more, doesn't all their time belong to their employer? Can they ever call a day their own, except one afternoon each week? They work sixteen and eighteen hours a day.

Pine Hill, N. J., Aug. 19, 1919.

## Who's to Blame?

(From The Toledo Blade)

Champ Clark says the Republican party is responsible for the high cost of living. And he is right. The Republican party precipitated the whole trouble when it neglected to win in 1918.

## Books

By Heywood Brown

IT SEEMS to us that Booth Tarkington belongs at the top or thereabouts in American letters. We will be surprised and disappointed if Perrod does not persist for a century or so. And yet much of Tarkington's work is flawed by a curious failing. Almost invariably the novels are carefully thought out to a certain point and then they weaken. This point occurs, as a rule, within a chapter or so of the end. The story "hangs," as the racetrack reporters express it, in the last few strides. In "Ramsey Milholland," for instance, it seemed to us that Tarkington, after a minute development of a theme, cut it off abruptly. He was, according to our impression, a little tired and anxious to hasten over with before he had actually reached the finishing mark. Today we read a story which may provide an explanation. "Booth Tarkington," says a publisher's note from Doubleday-Page, "probably has never lead pencils than any other writer in America. Always he has disdained a protractor. 'He works at an artist's drawing table,' and," the story continues, "with a little stock of paper before him he then sets about the actual business of composition very slowly, very carefully